



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

dence at hand (though one should not rely too much upon "Stamfords" in Milan and Spain), give Mr. Lipson's chapters their independent value. He is able at times to supplement Gross, Ashley, and Cunningham, writers whom he seldom equals in originality of thought and lucidity of expression. His volume, none the less, is a most useful handbook for the beginner and no one can afford to neglect his judicious summary of evidence winnowed from newly published borough records.

H. L. GRAY.

A History of France. By J. R. MORETON MACDONALD. In three volumes. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1915. Pp. xiv, 366; 399; 551.)

A COMPREHENSIVE and balanced history of France embodying the chief conclusions of modern investigation would be welcome to a large class of readers and would contribute to the general enlightenment. It cannot be said, however, that this service has been rendered by the work before us and the chief reason is indicated by the author himself in his preface. Writing from France at the end of May, 1915, he says that he is conscious that he has

overstated the temperamental characteristics, and in particular the temperamental weaknesses, of the French. The truly remarkable way in which, under the present trial, France has purified herself of her traditional vices and developed virtues which were supposed to be quite alien to her character drives one to the conclusion, not only that the temperamental qualities of nations change more rapidly than we have been accustomed to think, but also that they are often only qualities which have been foisted on nations by noisy minorities.

Whatever may be meant by noisy minorities foisting temperamental qualities upon nations, and the phrase is utterly baffling, the conclusion to which the reviewer is driven is, not that France has suddenly changed—a most unlikely and unhistorical proceeding—but that the author is very far from understanding the people whose history he has undertaken to write. Our confidence in his judgment and penetration is not increased when we read in the next paragraph that Frenchmen "live by instinct rather than by tradition", that "the range of their political vision is short", and that they lack the historical sense. One thing is clear at the outset. We have to do with another history of France written from the point of view of stiff British conservatism.

Mr. Macdonald's book covers the annals of France from Roman times down to 1871, in a little less than twelve hundred pages. The space assigned to the various periods is judicious. The first volume ends with Louis XII., the second with the removal of Louis XVI. to Paris in 1789, the third with the treaty of Frankfort. Some of the summaries in the first two volumes are excellent for their concision and clearness, as, for instance, those describing the Merovingian monarchy, Charlemagne, Louis XI., Sully, Richelieu, and Mazarin. The

author writes mainly of politics and war, giving much attention to military campaigns and some even to the technique of war. It is curious that in a narrative frequently clogged with a multitude of details and with dates galore you look in vain for the dates of Crécy and Poitiers. The treatment of the Renaissance is a brief and inadequate presentation of a significant phase of French development. The treatment of the Reformation is almost entirely political and military, yet the French Reformation was much more than a political movement conducive to civil wars.

It is when he reaches the Revolution, however, that the author becomes a particularly unsafe guide. We hear the same old refrain, in vogue ever since Edmund Burke published his blazing pamphlet, and verily not needing repetition. It is the "incendiary mob" that dominates the situation from the summer of 1789. Mirabeau is "the only statesman among dreamers". The storming of the Bastille is "the first great triumph of the forces of anarchy masquerading in the sheep's clothing of constitutionalism". The "failure of the men of 1789" indirectly provoking the deplorable excesses of the Revolution, "should be a warning to all politicians who sacrifice principle to power and accept the dictation of the proletariat". As to the division of France into departments, "the abandonment of local history and traditions was part and parcel of the stupid craving for absolute symmetry and uniformity which possesses a certain type of politician. It possessed the revolutionary politicians in very high degree, making them always eager to abandon tradition for ideas, in this case for mere mathematical precision. Complete severance with the past was one of the crazes and blemishes of the Revolution" (III. 5).

So much for the prevailing note of this account of the modern history of France. Moreover that account contains many errors of fact. The Declaration of the Rights of Man was not compiled "on the lines of that which appeared in the American Constitution" (II. 393) for the excellent reason that there was at that time no such section in that document, if by "American Constitution" is meant the Constitution of the United States. The Tennis Court oath was taken on June 20, not on June 21, 1789 (II. 385). The anniversary of the storming of the Bastille was not celebrated on June 14, 1790, because that was not the anniversary (III. 8). The Legislative Assembly was not elected under the influence of the September Massacres for the reason that those elections occurred in the summer of 1791 and the massacres in September, 1792 (III. 252). The Convention first met on September 20, 1792, not on October 20 (III. 24). Sieyès was not "the real author" of the Constitution of 1795 but on the contrary had practically nothing to do with its making (III. 61). Napoleon had nothing like 250,000 men in the Peninsula at the beginning of his Spanish adventure (III. 160). Pius VI. did not excommunicate Napoleon in 1809 (III. 172) nor was he at Fontainebleau on January 25, 1813 (III. 194), because he had

died in 1799. The first treaty of Paris was not signed on April 30, 1814, but on May 30 (III. 225). The electoral law of February 5, 1817, did not remain in force "for thirty years" (III. 257) but for only three years. Moreover in the very next paragraph the author refers, for our mystification, to "the electoral law of 5 September, 1817". The statement that Odilon Barrot was the leader of the Republican party in France about 1840 is amazing (III. 291) and is in contradiction with the statement three pages later (III. 294) that he was the leader of the Dynastic Left. The plébiscite of 1851 was held on December 20, not on December 30 (III. 318). Most emphatically Lesseps was not sent to Rome in 1849 "to arrange terms of peace at any price" (III. 313).

Speaking of Lamartine, whom he has previously characterized as a "great political hypnotist" and as having had an "ascendancy over all" parties under Louis Philippe, which is certainly news, the author states, "It is this dominance of Lamartine that makes the whole period of the Second Republic such a strange episode in government; almost laughable in its blunders, capricious contradictions, and inconsequences" (III. 300). It would be difficult to compress more misconceptions into a single phrase. After this it is perhaps unnecessary to point out that Bismarck was not at the Congress of Paris in 1856 (III. 327); that the Polish insurrection occurred in 1863, not 1862, as apparently stated on page 338 (vol. III.); that Bismarck did not hurry "ostentatiously to the side of Russia" and that his "unsolicited overtures" did not end in "an agreement between the two Powers for joint action (February 8, 1862)", one reason at least being that he did not enter the Prussian ministry until September, 1862 (III. 339).

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

An Economic History of Russia. By JAMES MAVOR, Ph.D., Professor of Political Economy, University of Toronto. In two volumes. (London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1914. Pp. xxxii, 614; xxi, 630.)

THE Anglo-Saxon world should welcome a pioneer work whose object is "to present to English readers the main result of recent historical researches which have been conducted by various Russian scholars". Professor Mavor has very conveniently divided his two massive volumes into seven books of about equal length and has covered the economic history of Russia from its beginning to 1907.

In certain external aspects of the book, the author may be unfavorably criticized. No uniform system of transliteration has been used throughout the work. Moreover, the author does not spell correctly in his transliterations, as when he transliterates the letter III by "tsch" in English (I. 40 ff.). It must be either "shch" or "shtch" or something similar. Frequent grammatical errors, such as the use of the